Filed 11/27/2006 Page 1 of 2 Alan Himmelfarb LAW OFFICES OF ALAN HIMMELFARB 2757 Leonis Blvd Los Angeles, CA 90058 Telephone: (323) 585-8696 Fax: (323) 585-8198 consumerlaw1@earthlink.net 5 Scott A. Kamber **Ethan Preston** KAMBER & ASSOCIATES, LLC 11 Broadway, 22d Floor New York, NY 10038 Telephone: (877) 773-5469 Fax: (212) 202-6364 skamber@kolaw.com epreston@kolaw.com Counsel for proposed intervenor, Dennis Dilbeck 10 11 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 13 NETFLIX, INC. a Delaware corporation, No. C 06 2361 WHA JCS 14 Judge William Alsup
DECLARATION OF ALAN 15 **HIMMELFARB** Plaintiff, 16 17 BLOCKBUSTER INC., a Delaware corporation, and DOES 1-50, 18 19 Defendants. 20 21 22 **DECLARATION OF ALAN HIMMELFARB** 23 24 25 26 27 28 Exhibit A to Dilbeck's Motion to Extend Time to 06 2361 File His Consolidated Reply

Netflix, Inc. v. Blockbuster, Inc.

Doc. 95 Att. 1

1
2

8 9 10

11 12

13 14

15 16 17

18

19 20

21

23

24

22

25 26

27

28

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C.§ 1746, I hereby declare as follows:

- I am admitted to the U.S. District Court of the Northern District of California. 1.
- 2. I read Federal Rule Civil Procedure 6(a) to modify Civil Local Rule 7-4's 14-day deadline to run "the end of the next day" after November 23 (Thanksgiving Day), November 24 (a legal holiday pursuant to Cal. Gov't Code § 19853(a)), November 25 (a Saturday), and November 26 (a Sunday) – i.e., November 27.
- I believed that Dilbeck's Consolidated Reply in Support of his Motion for Leave to 3. Intervene was timely filed on November 27 until I received a phone call from the Court's clerk.
- Counsel has not contacted the existing parties in connection with this Motion. Under the circumstances, counsel believed it would be better to file the attached Motion to Extend Time immediately rather than delay further seeking a stipulation from the existing parties to extend the time to file the Consolidated Reply.
- 5. The existing parties have already filed their oppositions to Dilbeck's Motion to Intervene and are not prejudiced by the extension of time sought by Dilbeck. The Court has been deprived of one business day's time to review Dilbeck's Consolidated Reply. Hence, Counsel believes the prejudice to the Court and to the case's schedule is negligible.
- Dilbeck has not previously sought any modifications of any other time limits in this 6. case.
- I declare under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATE: November 27, 2006

/s/Alan Himmelfarb ALAN HIMMELFARB